UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/504,236	02/15/2000	Swain W. Porter	112076-138321	7611

25943 7590 04/21/2005	**EXAMINER**

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITES 1600-1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

BAUGH, APRIL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/504,236	PORTER, SWAIN W.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	April L. Baugh	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-55* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-55* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .   6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office

action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-7 and 9-55 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 9-55 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-27, 28-32, 39-41, and 43-49 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,874,023 to Pennell et al. in view of

Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Referring to claim 1, Pennell et al. teaches a method comprising: a user computer, on behalf of a user, registering the user with a first web site; the user computer providing a first email address received from an email service provider for use to register the user with said first web site; the user computer, on behalf of the user, registering the user with a second website; and the user computer providing a second email address received from the email service provider, separate and distinct from the first email address, for use to register said user with said second web site (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 24-34); wherein either the first and second email addresses were simultaneously pre-provided to the user computer by the email service provider, or each of the first and second email addresses is provided to the user computer by the email service provider in real time in response to a first and a second request (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach email address provided to the user computer by the email service provider post enrollment of the user as a service subscriber of the email service provider. AAPA teaches the email address provided to the user computer by the email service provider post enrollment of the user as a service subscriber of the email service provider (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by providing email address to the user computer by the email service provider post enrollment of the user as a service subscriber of the email service provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce

an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive

email through the provider.

Referring to claim 21, Pennell et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device

(e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3,

lines 35-42); the e-device selecting a first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate

communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners

(CP/GCP); and the e-device selecting a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate

communication with a second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 24-

34).

Pennell et al. does not teach an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of

distinct email addresses from an email service provider. AAPA teaches an electronic device

(e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider (pg. 1,

lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and

providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships

between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by having the an electronic device (e-device)

obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider because the email

service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the

subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 24 Pennell et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device

(e-device) requesting and receiving for a user, a first email address (column 3, lines 1-12 and

column 3, lines 35-42); the e-device employing the received first email address to facilitate

communication between the user and a first communication partner or group of communication

partners (CP/GCP); the e-device requesting and receiving for the user, a second email address,

separate and distinct from said first email address; and the e-device employing the received

second email address to facilitate communication between the user and a second CP/GCP

(column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 24-34).

Pennell et al. does not teach an electronic device (e-device) requesting and receiving a

first and second email address from an email service provider. AAPA teaches an electronic

device (e-device) requesting and receiving a first and second email address from an email service

provider (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for

monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to

relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by having the an electronic

device (e-device) requesting and receiving a first and second email address from an email service

provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email

address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 28, Pennell et al. teaches a method comprising: providing at least a first

and a second email address, that are separate and distinct, to the e-device for use by the e-device

to facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second communication partner or

group of communication partners (CP/GCP) (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3,

lines 1-12 and 24-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach an email service provider registering a user as a service

subscriber of the email service provider; and the email service provider providing at least an

email address. AAPA teaches an email service provider registering a user as a service subscriber

of the email service provider; and the email service provider providing at least an email address

(pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring

and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships

between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by a email service provider registering a user

as a service subscriber of the email service provider; and the email service provider providing at

least an email address because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce

an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive

email.

Regarding claim 39, Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium

having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus

(when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email

addresses (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42), to selecting a first of said distinct

email addresses to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of

communication partners (CP/GCP), and to select a second of said distinct email addresses to

facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP; and a processor coupled to the storage medium

to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and

column 3, lines 24-34).

Pennell et al. does not teach the apparatus (when the programming instructions are

executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses from an email service provider. AAPA

teaches the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of

distinct email addresses from an email service provider (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the

detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network

sites of Pennell et al. by the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to

obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses from an email service provider because the email

service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the

subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 41, Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium

having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus

(when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email

address in real time (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42), and correspondingly

earmarking said first and second distinct email addresses to facilitate communication between a

user and a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners

(CP/GCP); and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of

programming instructions (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 24-34).

Pennell et al. does not teach enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are

executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in

real time. AAPA teaches enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed)

to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in real time

(pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring

and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships

between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by enable the apparatus (when the

programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from

an email service provider in real time because the email service provider's (email server)

function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may

send and receive email.

Regarding claim 45. Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage

medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions design to provide at least

an email address, that are separate and distinct, to an electronic device of the user for use by the

electronic device to facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second

communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and a processor coupled

to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61

and column 3, lines 1-12 and 24-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach enable the apparatus (when the programming

instructions are executed) to register a user as a service subscriber of the apparatus, and to

provide at least a first and a second email address. AAPA teaches enable the apparatus (when the

programming instructions are executed) to register a user as a service subscriber of the apparatus,

and to provide at least a first and a second email address (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the

detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network

sites of Pennell et al. by enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed)

to register a user as a service subscriber of the apparatus, and to provide at least a first and a

second email address because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce

an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive

email.

Regarding claim 3, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first email

address comprises an address of the email service provider, and the second email address

comprises the address of the same email service provider (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3,

lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 5, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said

providing of the first and second email addresses by the user computer comprises selecting said

first/second email address from a plurality of distinct email addresses provided by said email

service provider to said user computer (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Referring to claim 6, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the method

further comprises the user computer pre-obtaining the distinct email addresses from the email

service provider (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 9, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said

providing of the first and second email addresses by the user computer comprises the user

computer dynamically obtaining said first/second email address from the email service provider s

the user computer registers the user with the first/second web site (column 3, lines 1-12 and

column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 12, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method

further comprises the user computer notifying the email service provider of the usage of the first

and second email address, including addresses of the first and the second web site (abstract and

column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Regarding claim 13, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein each of said

notification is performed integrally as said first/second email address is provided to said user for

use to register the user with the first/second web site (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and

column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 14, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein said

notifications are performed subsequently in batch after said first and second email addresses

were provided to said user for use to register the user with the first and the second web site

(abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 20, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the web site is

a selected one of a content provider, a service provider and an access provider (column 1, lines

17-31).

Regarding claim 22, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the method

further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selection of the first of

said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device

notifying the email service provider of said selection of the second of said distinct email

addresses to facilitate communication with the second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-

12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Referring to claim 23, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the

method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selections of

the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first

and the second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Referring to claim 25, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the method

further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said employment of the

first email address to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device notifying

the email service provider of said employment of the second email address to facilitate

communication with the second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines

31-42).

Regarding to claim 26, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each of said

notifications is made integrally when the e-device requests for said first/second email address

from said email service provider (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 27, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each

of said notifications is made after the e-device having been provided with said first/second email

address from said email service provider (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines

35-42).

Referring to claim 29, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method

comprises the email service provider providing a plurality of distinct email addresses to an

electronic device (e-device) used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second

separate and distinct email addresses (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Referring to claim 30, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method

comprises the email service provider providing in real time said first/second email address to an

electronic device used by the user (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 31, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 32, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an electronic device used by the user (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 40, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 39, wherein the programming instructions further enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to notify the email service provider of said selection of the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and the second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 42, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 41, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to notify of said employment of the first and second email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 43, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said notifications integrally when requesting for said first/second email address from said email service provider (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 44, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said notifications after having been provided with said first/second email address from said email service provider (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 46, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide a plurality of distinct email addresses to an electronic device (e-device) used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second separate and distinct email addresses (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 47, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide in real time said first/second email address to an electronic device used by the user (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 48, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 49, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an electronic device used by the user (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

2.   Claims 2, 4, 7, 10, and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Patent No. 6,874,023 to Pennell et al. and AAPA as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-27,

28-32, 39-41, and 43-49 above, and further in view of Linden et al.

Regarding claim 2, Pennell et al. and AAPA teaches the method of claim 1 (column 1,

lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach of identifiers contained in the email

address. Linden et al. teaches the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the

second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user

identifier (column 8, lines 62-63 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web

based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event

information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell

et al. in view of AAPA by having identifiers contained in the email address because this

distinguishes one user who subscribes to the website from another user that subscribes to the

same website.

Referring to claim 4, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 1,

wherein the first email address comprises an address of the email service provider, and the

second email address comprises the address of the same email service provider (column 3, lines

1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach of identifiers contained in the email

address. Linden et al. teaches the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the

second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user

identifier (column 8, lines 62-63 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web

based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event

information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell

et al. in view of AAPA by having identifiers contained in the email address because this

distinguishes one user who subscribes to the website from another user that subscribes to the

same website.

Referring to claim 7, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 6 (column

1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach of pre-generation of email addresses. Linden

et al. teaches the method further comprises the email service provider pre-generating the distinct

email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the

web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event

information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell

et al. in view of AAPA by pre-generating email addresses because this eliminates the need for

the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Referring to claim 10, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA the method of claim 9, wherein each

of said dynamically obtaining comprises the email service provider selecting said first/second

email address (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach pre-generation of distinct email addresses.

Linden et al. teaches selecting said first/second email address from a plurality of pre-generated

distinct email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by pre-generating distinct email addresses because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Regarding claim 11, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 9 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address. Linden et al. teaches the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of and AAPA by having the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

3.   Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,874,023 to Pennell et al. in view of AAPA as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-27, 28-32, 39-41, and 43-49 above, and further in view of Kamiya et al.

Referring to claim 15, Pennell et al. in view of and AAPA teaches the method of claim 1

(column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach organizing said received emails based at

least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address. Kamiya

et al. teaches receiving emails addressed to said first and second email addresses; organizing said

received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the

second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the

detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network

sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by organizing said received emails based at least in part

on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address because this helps

the user discern from which website the emails are from.

4.   Claims 16-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent

6,874,023 to Pennell et al. in view of AAPA and Kamiya et al. as applied to claim 15 above, and

further in view of Flemming, III.

Regarding claim 16, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA and Kamiya teaches the method of

claim 15 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA and Kamiya does not teach organizing of said received

emails. Flemming, III teaches organizing of said received emails is at least further based on

whether said received emails addressed to said first/second email addresses were sent by said

first/second web site or not (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56). Therefore it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the

detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network

sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA and Kamiya by organizing of said received emails

because this notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 17, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 16

(column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach deleting all received emails not sent by said

first/second web site. Kamiya et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to said

first/second email addresses not sent by said first/second web site, while preserving all undeleted

emails addressed to said first/second email addresses sent by said first/second web site (column

4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore

it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a

summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user

and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by deleting all received emails not sent by

said first/second web site because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not

subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 18, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 17

(column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach deletion is performed in response to an

instruction of said user. Kamiya et al. teaches said bifurcated deletion is performed in response to

an instruction of said user (column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the

detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network

sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by having the deletion performed in response to an

instruction of said user because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from

registered websites.

Referring to claim 19, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 18

(column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach providing said deletion instruction

with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches providing the user with an end

user interface feature to provide said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control

button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of

the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and

network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by providing said deletion instruction with a

single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to

quickly delete any unwanted emails.

1.   Claims 33-38, 50-55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Patent No. 6,874,023 to Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. and further in view of Fleming,

III.

Regarding claim 33, Pennell et al. teaches of a email service provider receiving emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user (column 3, lines 13-20 and column 3, lines 53-65), the first and second email addresses having been provided to an electronic (e-device) of the user for the e-device to facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second intended communication partner respectively (column 3, lines 1-12 and 35-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches a email service provider receiving emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user; and the email service provider organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of

the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and

network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by organizing said received emails based

at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended

communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user

discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are

from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 34, Pennell et al. teaches of email addresses (column 3, lines 1-20 and

35-42 and 53-65).

Pennell et al. does not teach emails characterized by at least said first and second email

addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches emails characterized by at least said first and second email

addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the

detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network

sites of Pennell et al. by emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses

because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach providing said emails to the user, with

the emails characterized by intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and

second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches providing said emails to the user, with the emails

characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first

and second email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was
made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a
summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user
and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by providing said emails to the user,
with the emails characterized by at least said and intended versus unintended communication
partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which
website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the
user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 35, Pennell et al. teaches receiving emails by an electronic device (e-
device) of a user, from an email service provider; and presenting by the e-device said emails for
viewing by the user (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach emails are characterized based at least in part on by email
addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches emails are characterized based at least in part on by email
addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been
obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further
modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the
detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network
sites of Pennell et al. by emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses
because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach emails are characterized based at least
in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses.
Flemming, III teaches receiving emails, from an email service provider, wherein the emails are

characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses; and presenting said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at least said email addresses and said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by having the emails characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 36, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 35 of email addresses (column 4, lines 9-21.).

Pennell et al. does not teach deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address. Kamiya et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email

address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address because

these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this

frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 37, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 36 of email addresses

(column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach deletion is performed in response to user instruction. Kamiya et

al. teaches deletion is performed in response to user instruction (column 17, lines 24-30 of

Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring

and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships

between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by having deletion performed in response to

user instruction because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered

websites.

Referring to claim 38, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 37 of email addresses

(column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach providing the user with an end user interface feature to

provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches

providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single

press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et

al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and

providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships

between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by providing the user with an end user

interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button

because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

Regarding claim 50, Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium

having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus

(when the program instructions are executed) to receive emails addressed to a first and a second

email address of a user (column 3, lines 13-20 and 53-65), wherein the first and second email

addresses having been provided to an electronic device (e-device) of the user for the e-device to

facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second intended communication

partner respectively (column 3, lines 1-12 and 35-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said first

and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches organize said received emails based at least in

part on said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-

28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and

providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships

between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by organize said received emails based at

least in part on said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from

which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at

least in part on said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second

email addresses. Flemming, III teaches receive emails addressed to a first and a second email

address of a user, and to organize said received emails based at least in part on intended versus

unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses; and a processor

coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 3,

lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, Ill.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email

control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information

organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view

of Kamiya et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on intended versus

unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps

the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the

emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 51, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 50, wherein the

programming instructions (column 3, lines 1-20, 35-42, and 53-65).

Pennell et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said first

and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches organize said received emails based at least in

part on said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-

28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and

providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships

between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by organize said received emails based at

least in part on said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from

which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by providing said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 52, Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to receive emails from an email service provider, and to present said emails for viewing by a user (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the

detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network

sites of Pennell et al. by emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses

because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach emails being characterized based at

least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email

addresses. Flemming, III. teaches receiving emails from an email service provider, the emails

being characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners

of each of said email addresses, and to present said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at

least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses; and a

processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions

(column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web

based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event

information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell

et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by emails being characterized based at least in part on intended

versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this helps the

user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails

are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 53, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 52, wherein the

programming instructions (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email

address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address.

Kamiya et al. teaches delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not

sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address (column 4, lines 3-

10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of

the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and

network sites of Pennell et al. by deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email

address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address

because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites

therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 54, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 53, wherein the

programming instructions (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach perform said deletion in response to user instruction. Kamiya

et al. teaches perform said deletion in response to user instruction (column 17, lines 24-30 of

Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring

and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships

between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by performing said deletion in response to

user instruction because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered

websites.

Referring to claim 55, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 54, wherein the

programming instructions (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach provide the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches provide the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to online information transaction systems in general: Gabber et al., Klug et al., Light et al., and Feinleib et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L. Baugh whose telephone number is 571-272-3877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER